

ANALELE ȘTIINȚIFICE ALE
UNIVERSITĂȚII „AL. I. CUZA” IAȘI
Tom LVIII, s. II – c, Geografie 2012
ISSN 1223-5334 (printed version)



© Author(s) 2012. CC Attribution 3.0 License

SCIENTIFIC ANNALS OF
“AL. I. CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI
Volume LVIII, s. II – c, Geography series 2012
(online version) 2284-6379 e-ISSN

INFLUENCE OF URBANIZATION ON LIVING AWAY TYPE OF MARRIAGE: THE CASE OF KAMPALA CITY (UGANDA)

Fredrick TUMWINE^{1*} and James NTOZI²

^{1*} Department of Geography, Geo-informatics and Climatic Sciences, Makerere University, Uganda
tumwru@arts.mak.ac.ug

² Department of Population Studies, Makerere University, Uganda
jntozi@isae.mak.ac.ug

Abstract. Living away type of marriage was found to be on an upward trend and more common in urban (36.1%) than rural areas (19.2%). Logistic regression analysis showed that urban residents were 2 times more likely to be in living away type of marriage than their rural counterparts. Area of residence was the most significant factor in influencing living away type of marriage. The study revealed that living away type of marriage was due to some married men being migrant workers leaving their wives at home to maintain their family investments and the nature of jobs that make separation of spouses inevitable. The problem of accommodation in urban areas due to shortage of houses was evident from being responsible for 17% of urban residents in living away type of marriage. Living away type of marriage was implicated as being one of the causes of the spread of HIV/AIDs. Separation of couples predisposes these groups to have sexual contacts with multiple partners. Married spouses that stayed together were at lower risk of being HIV seropositive than those staying apart (UNFPA, 2006).

Keywords: *Urbanization and Living away type of marriage*

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the level of urbanization is low in Uganda, it is rising very fast. While in 1950 Uganda's urban population was only 3%, it increased to 6.6% in 1969, 7.4% in 1980, 11.3% in 1991 and 12.3% in 2002. It is predicted to increase to 30% by 2030 (UBOS, 2002). The majority of the urban population (80%) is classified as poor or low-income earners and lack access to adequate housing and infrastructure. For example, 60% of the residents in Kampala live in slums (UNFPA, 2004). As a result, urbanization influences marriage patterns, one of which is living away type of marriage.

Kampala is the capital city of Uganda and the largest urban area in terms of population and size. The primacy rate of Kampala has varied from 54% in 1969,

48% in 1980, 41% in 1991 and 40% in 2002. Kampala remained the primate city because of in-migration and immigration rather than natural population increase. Over half (53%) of residents of Kampala were born outside the city. It is the largest recipient of internal migrants, having 15.1% of all the total internal migrants (UBOS, 2002). The purpose of this paper is to examine the background factors and reasons for living away type of marriages.

II. DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

The study was based on primary data collected in 2004 using a questionnaire and focus group discussions (FGDs) in Kampala city and rural districts of Mpigi, Kisoro, Sironko and Arua (see Figure 1).



Fig. 1. Location of the study districts in Uganda
(Source: Population and Housing Census Map, 2002)

Four ethnic groups namely: Baganda in Mpigi; Bafumbira in Kisoro; Bagisu in Sironko and Lugbara in Arua who are the majority in the respective districts and many of them have migrated to Kampala city were interviewed.

A total number of 301 respondents were studied in the quantitative sub-study. Questions in the sub-study included: *Do you stay with your spouse throughout the year? If no why?* Those who stayed with their partners most of the time in the year fell in the living with partner type of marriage and those who did not, belonged to the living away type of marriage.

Focus Group Discussions were conducted in the qualitative sub-study. A total number of 16 Focus Group Discussions were utilized. In both Kampala city and the rural areas, males and females formed separate discussions groups.

The Chi-square statistic at $p < 0.05$ was used to determine the relationship between the dependent variable (living away type of marriage) and independent variables (area of residence, religion, education, tribe and occupation). Logistic regression as a multivariate analysis was used to test the effect of the independent variables on living away type of marriage.

III. BACKGROUND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH LIVING AWAY TYPE OF MARRIAGE

III.1. Area of residence

Living away type of marriage is much higher among urban respondents (36%) than with rural respondents (19%) as observed from Table 1 and Fig. 2. This is supported by 24% of the urban residents who attributed their living away type of marriage to having left their wives in the village and 24.7% whose spouses work far away from Kampala in Table 7. Female respondents have a higher percentage (31%) of living away type of marriage than males (24%).




Fig.2. Area of residence and living with/away types of marriage

This could be as a result of polygamy. Men with two or more wives may not stay with all the wives at the same time. This is more common when a man has one wife in Kampala and another in the village. Also, some monogamous men who work in Kampala leave their wives in the villages due to economic reasons. Chi-

square test shows a strong association between area of residence and living with and living away types of marriage ($p = 0.000$).

Table 1. Living with and living away types of marriage by sex and area of residence

Area of residence	Rural		Urban		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Males	301	100	261	100	562	100
Living with	271	90.0	157	60.2	428	76.2
Living away	30	10.0	104	39.8	134	23.8
Chi-square = 68.731, $p = 0.000$						
Females	282	100	263	100	545	100
Living with	200	70.9	178	67.7	378	69.4
Living away	82	29.1	85	32.3	167	30.6
Chi-square = 0.673, $p = 0.412$						
Both sexes	583	100	524	100	1107	100
Living with	471	80.8	335	63.9	806	72.8
Living away	112	19.2	189	36.1	301	27.2
Chi-square = 39.614, $p = 0.000$						

III.2. Religion

Moslems reported the highest incidence of living away marriage pattern (31%) compared with 29% for the Protestants and only 24% for the Catholics as evident in Table 2 and Fig. 3. This could be attributed to the fact that Moslems are more polygamous than Christians and therefore couples do not stay together all the time. On the other hand, Christianity stresses that man and wife should be together all the time as observed from the following scriptures in the Bible: *"For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh"* Ephesians 5:31.




Fig. 3. Religion and living away/with type of marriage

Table 2. Living with and living away types of marriage by sex and religion[illegible]

III.3. Education

Table 3 and Fig. 4 show that the lower the level of education the higher the chances of spouses living separately. Respondents with no education showed the highest percentage of living away pattern (34.7%). Those with primary education (27%), secondary (26%) and tertiary (25%) followed in that order. The least educated men do not move to urban areas to seek employment with their wives. They leave them at home in the village. The highly educated men in many cases marry fellow educated women who are likely to be employed as well. It is also observed that the females reported far much higher incidences (30.6%) of living away than the males (23.8%).

Table 3. Living with and living away types of marriage by sex and education

[illegible]




Fig. 5. Tribe and living with/away types of marriage

III.4. Occupation

The study further found that respondents of the following occupations stay with their partners most of the time in the year: professionals (77.8%) and farmers (78%) as evident in Table 5 and Figure 6. On the other hand, only 25% of the students stay with their partners all the year around because very few are formally married. It was observed that 100% of students started by co-habiting before they formalized their marriages (Tumwine, 2006).




Fig. 6. Occupation and living with/away types of marriage

Table 5. Living with and living away types of marriage by sex and occupation

	Professional		Farmer		Trader		Student		Other		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Males	132	100	192	100	83	100	4	100	151	100	562	100
Living with	103	78.0	173	90.1	47	56.6	1	25.0	104	68.9	428	76.2
Living away	29	22.0	19	9.9	36	43.4	3	75.0	47	31.1	134	23.8
Chi-square = 48.434, p = 0.000												
Females	62	100	230	100	70	100	4	100	179	100	545	100
Living with	48	77.4	158	68.7	45	64.3	1	25.0	126	70.4	378	69.4
Living away	14	22.6	72	31.3	25	35.7	3	75.0	53	29.6	167	30.6
Chi-square = 6.584, p = 0.160												
Both sexes	194	100	422	100	153	100	8	100	330	100	1107	100
Living with	151	77.8	331	78.4	92	60.1	2	25.0	230	69.7	806	72.8
Living away	43	22.2	91	21.6	61	39.9	6	75.0	100	30.3	301	27.2
Chi-square = 32.498, p = 0.000												

IV. REGRESSION ANALYSIS SHOWING AREA OF RESIDENCE VIS-À-VIS SELECTED FACTORS AND LIVING AWAY TYPE OF MARRIAGE

In order to test the hypothesis that living away type of marriage is likely to be more practiced by urban than rural residents, logistic regression was applied. When running the regression model, value 1 stands for living with marriage and 0 for living away marriages. The results in Table 4 show that area of residence significantly influences living with and living away types of marriage. In fact, residence is the most significant factor in influencing living with and living away types of marriage. The negative B values (-0.98) for urban show a negative relationship between living with type of marriage and urban residence. This result implies that, urbanization encourages living away type of marriage pattern. The hypothesis that: "living away type of marriage is likely to be more practiced by urban than rural residents" is accepted.

Tribe was the second most important factor in affecting living with and living away types of marriage. The Bagisu were found to stay with their spouses about 2 times (Exp (B) = 1.9) more than the Bafumbira (reference category). The Lugbara were 2 times (Exp (B) = 1.5) more likely to stay with their spouses than the Bafumbira. The Baganda were not found to be different (Exp (B) = 1.1) from the Bafumbira. The Bafumbira were least likely to be living with their spouses because many men leave their wives in Kisoro and migrate to work in Kampala.

Professionals were 9 times (Exp (B) = 9.0), farmers 8 times (Exp (B) = 8.0), other category 8 times (Exp (B) = 7.9) and traders 6 times (Exp (B) = 5.6) more likely to be living with their spouses than students (reference category). This is expected because students spend most of their time in institutions of learning.

Considering education, the higher the level, and the higher the chances of spouses living together. Respondents with primary education were 2 times (Exp

(B) = 1.8), those with secondary education 2 times (Exp (B) = 2.1) and those with tertiary education were 3 times (Exp (B) = 2.7) more likely to be living with their spouses than those with no education (reference category).

Table 6. Logistic regression analysis showing impact of residence and selected factors on living with type of marriage

Living with type of marriage		B	Std. Error	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Residence	Intercept	-1.318	.908	2.105	.147	
	Urban	-.978	.200	23.998	.000	.376
Religion	Rural #	0(a)
	Catholic	-.053	.251	.045	.832	.948
Education	Protestant	-.157	.250	.397	.528	.854
	Moslem #	0(a)
Tribe	Primary	.576	.229	6.312	.012	1.778
	Secondary	.760	.270	7.927	.005	2.139
Occupation	Tertiary	.978	.318	9.426	.002	2.658
	None #	0(a)
Baganda	Baganda	.082	.209	.154	.695	1.086
	Bagisu	.650	.226	8.313	.004	1.916
Lugbara	Lugbara	.426	.201	4.500	.034	1.532
	Bafumbira #	0(a)
Professional	Professional	2.198	.848	6.718	.010	9.005
	Farmer	2.080	.871	5.702	.017	8.006
Other	Other	2.074	.844	6.033	.014	7.953
	Trader	1.732	.855	4.102	.043	5.651
Student #	Student #	0(a)

= Reference category

V. REASONS FOR LIVING AWAY TYPE OF MARRIAGE

The respondents who declared that they were in living away type of marriage were asked to give the reasons for the situation. Respondents who practiced living away type of marriage were also asked to give reasons why they did not stay with their spouses most of the time. The responses are summarized in Table 7. There were more reasons given by urban residents than their rural counterparts. Half of the respondents (50%) in the rural areas who practice living away type of marriage indicated that their partners work in Kampala. Mbiti (1986) regards this type of marriage as “separation out of economic necessity”. He also identifies the causes of the separation of working partner as failing to take the wife to city due to shortage of housing and inadequate money. Another reason is for the wife to stay looking after the family property.

Having another wife (polygamy) was also responsible for living away pattern of 20% in the rural compared to 9% of the urban areas. This was due to higher levels of polygamy in the rural areas. It was observed that polygamous

The results further show that 11% of the urban and 1.3% of the rural respondents were practicing living away type of marriage because they were not yet officially married. This could be attributed to co-habitation. The problem of accommodation was responsible for the existence of living away type of marriage with 17.0% of the urban and 1.3% of the rural respondents. The higher percentage of living away pattern due to accommodation in urban areas could be as a result of the high cost of housing.

IV. TRENDS IN LIVING AWAY TYPE OF MARRIAGE

Figures 7 and 8 show that living away type of marriage is increasing with time. The younger the age group, the higher the level of living away type of marriage in both the rural and urban areas. Urban respondents in living away type of marriage double those in rural areas.

Table 8. Trends in living away type of marriage

		40⁺	30-39	20-29	Under 20
Rural	Living with	100.0%	88.9%	82.4%	80.5%
	Living away	0.0%	11.1%	17.6%	19.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Urban	Living with	0.0%	100.0%	65.4%	63.2%
	Living away	0.0%	0.0%	34.6%	36.8%
	Total	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%




Fig. 7. Rural trends in living away marriages for various age groups




Fig. 8. Urban trends in living away marriage for various age groups

V. CONCLUSIONS

Urbanization in Uganda like else where is an inevitable process and is therefore expected to continue. Urbanization was found to be the most significant factor in influencing living away type of marriage. Housing estate developers should be supported and encouraged to provide affordable houses especially to low income earners. Government policy of encouraging all the districts in the country to set apart land for the establishment of industries should be taken seriously and supported by district and municipal leaders. This will go a long way in decongesting Kampala city

References

- Anderson, G.: Trends in marriage formation in Sweden 1971-1993, Stockholm, Sweden, Stockholm University, Demography unit, 1995 Aug. 18. Stockholm Research Reports in Demography No. 96, 1995.
- Kaijuka, E.M., Kaija, Z.A.E., Cross, A.R. and Loaiza, E. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 1988/89, Ministry of health Entebbe, Uganda in collaboration with Ministry of Planning and Economic Development, Department of Geography, Makerere University, Institute of Statistics and Applied Economics, Makekere University and Institute for Resource Development/macro Systems, Inc. Colombia, Maryland, U.S.A.
- Mbiti, J. S.: Love and marriage in Africa, Longman Singapore Publishers Ptc. Ltd., 1986.
- Mbiti, J.: African religion and philosophy, Henemann, London, U.K., 1975.
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning: The 1991 Population and Housing Census, Kampala district, Statistics Division Ministry of Planning and Economic Development, Entebbe, Uganda, 1992.

- Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning: 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Entebbe, Uganda, 2005.
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Statistics Department: Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 1995, Macro International Inc, Calverton, Maryland USA, August 1996.
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning: Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2000/2001, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Entebbe, Uganda, 2002.
- Noriko, O. T.: Nuptiality Change in Asia: Patterns, Causes and Prospects, Keio University, Faculty of Economics, 2001.
- Tumwine F.R.: The impact of urbanization on marriage patterns in Lake Victoria Crescent, 1960-2002, PhD Thesis, Makerere University, 2006.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics: 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census, Provisional Results. National Census Office, 2002.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics: 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census, Main Report. National Census Office, 2005.
- United Nations Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT). An urbanizing world: Global report on human settlements, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- UNFPA: State of Uganda Population Report 2005, Towards a Healthy and Prosperous Population, 2005.
- UNFPA: State of Uganda Population Report 2006, Linking Population, Energy and Environment: A critical path way to poverty eradication and sustainable development. Designed and printed by Intersoft, 2006.
- Weeks, J.R.: Population: An introduction to concepts and issues, Watworth publishing Company. Belmont, California A division of Wadsworth Inc, 1989.

Received: 26.03.2012

Revised: 10.05.2012

Accepted: 23.05.2012

Published: 05.07.2012